



Linguistics and Literature Review (LLR)

Volume 4, Issue 2, October 2018

Journal DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32350/llr>
Issue DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32350/llr.42>

ISSN: 2221-6510 (Print) 2409-109X (Online) Journal homepage: <http://journals.umt.edu.pk/llr/Home.aspx>

Analyzing Literary Texts through Functional Grammar

Naveed Rehan

To cite to this article: Naveed Rehan (2018): Analyzing Literary Texts through Functional Grammar, *Linguistics and Literature Review* 4(2): 119- 133.

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.32350/llr.42.04>

Published online: October 31, 2018

Article QR Code:



Naveed Rehan



A publication of the
Department of English Language and Literature
School of Social Sciences and Humanities
University of Management and Technology
Lahore, Pakistan

Analyzing Literary Texts through Functional Grammar

Naveed Rehan
University of Management and Technology- Lahore, Pakistan

ABSTRACT

Functional Grammar (FG) was developed by Michael Halliday in the 1960s as a model of grammar to show how language *functions* in a text. In this paper, I analyze and compare two texts through the lens of FG. I attempt to show that FG is a useful tool for analyzing literary texts. The texts I use are excerpts from two essays: “Love” by D. H. Lawrence, and “A Short History of Love” by Lawrence Stone. Canonical writers of English like D. H. Lawrence or James Joyce—to give but two examples—often depart from traditional grammatical rules in order to make their language express something that correct grammar is incapable of communicating. FG uncovers fascinating details about how writers construct their texts in keeping with their purpose and audience. While both the texts I analyze talk about the same phenomenon (romantic love) and reach the same conclusions, the means by which they reach these conclusions are very different—Lawrence uses a highly subjective and rhetorical style, whereas Stone, a historian, presents a more objective and scientific argument. My aim is to show that language users have linguistic choices and that these choices are seldom neutral.

Keywords: functional grammar, systemic linguistics, literary analysis

Introduction

In her essay from this volume, “Construing the ‘primitive’ primitively: Grammatical parallelism as patterning and positioning strategy in D. H. Lawrence,” Miller (2010) had analyzed the language of modernist British writer D. H. Lawrence through the lens of functional grammar. She argued that “the chief linguistic resource through which Lawrence constructs his style is grammatical parallelism” (p. 41), and gave examples from his writings to support her claim.

Following Miller, in an attempt to show exactly how functional grammar can be helpful in discovering how Lawrence’s language *functions*, I give a formal functional grammar analysis of an excerpt from Lawrence’s essay “Love” in the following pages. To illustrate this method further

CONTACT Naveed Rehan at neveed.rehan@umt.edu.pk

I also examine an excerpt from historian Lawrence Stone's arguably famous essay, "A Short History of Love." The two texts are similar in that they talk about the same phenomenon and reach the same conclusions about it. Both claim that romantic love is not the universal and static idea it is made out to be by poets and novelists. However, the means by which they reach this conclusion are different. Lawrence uses a subjective, philosophical and poetic approach to tackle the subject, while Stone relies on a socio-historical analysis. Both texts are well-written and persuasive in their own way; but they use different linguistic resources to make their point.

The question I investigate in this paper is whether functional grammar can be a useful tool in conducting literary analysis. For this purpose, I will analyze each of the chosen texts separately in terms of their experiential, interpersonal and textual functions. I will then compare them. Here I describe the three metafunctions of language as defined by FG:

Systemic theory argues that there are three main metafunctions (or 'meanings') of language, and these are expressed at the level of the clause." These are: Experiential, Interpersonal, and Textual. These metafunctions are typically not exclusive but are all expressed at the same time. *Experiential meaning* describes how language is used to construct a view of reality. It represents reality as consisting of (1) Happenings and states (called 'processes,' represented by verbal groups); (2) Entities (called 'participants,' represented by nominal groups); and (3) Circumstances (often represented by prepositional phrases and adverbial groups). (Wolter, 2009)

In FG, Register Theory "argues that texts vary in three main areas according to the social situation. These are Field, Tenor and Mode. *Field* refers to the subject matter of the text and the institutional context. *Tenor* refers to the social roles of those involved in communication, and *Mode* refers to the means of communication. These three areas are directly linked with the three metafunctions" (Wolter & Spring, 2009). The Experiential metafunction has four main types of processes: Material, Mental, Verbal and Relational. The first refer to "clauses in which some participant acts upon the material world or is acted upon in some way." The second ones are "concerned with the 'goings on' of the human mind" and "construe a person involved in things like cognition, emotion and perception." The third "involve some sort of communication or symbolic activity" and the last ones are "concerned with being and having." Relational processes serve four interrelated functions: Identification (identifying an entity by equating it with some other entity e.g. "Mary is the woman in pink"); Attributive (attaching attributes or qualities to some entity in order to describe it); Possessive (indicating possession); and Locational (locating an entity). Material processes have two main aspects: Actor (the doer) and Goal (the acted upon). Mental processes also have two main participant types: Senser (person who experiences) and Phenomenon (focus of the mental event). Verbal processes have Sayer (person who says) and Verbiage (what was said), and Relational processes have Token (the thing to be identified) and Value (thing by which identification is made). (Wolter, 2009)

Interpersonal Meaning describes how speakers use language to interact in specific ways with their listeners. It makes use of the mood system in language. “The mood system is the system that allows us to construct the three basic types of clause (declarative, interrogative, imperative) through manipulation of the Subject and the Finite” (Wolter, 2009). The Finite is what locates an action, thought etc in time (e.g. Tom ran; Tom has eaten etc). Non-finite clauses do not indicate time (e.g. “preparing to run”; “having eaten lunch” etc) and are therefore unarguable. Modals are used to position the speaker in relation to the message (e.g. can, may, might, will, must etc). We use modals for more nuanced speech. Modal Finites “express modality through manipulation of the Finite itself.” That is, they replace the finite (e.g. “Tom ran” vs. “Tom must have run”). “Textual Meaning shows how we use linguistics to indicate whether the information is old or new; to indicate the speaker’s angle on the information; and to indicate the presence or absence of something in the immediate physical environment. Theme is everything up to and including the first experiential component in the clause (the first Participant, Process or Circumstance)” (Wolter, 2009). These (topical) themes can sometimes be combined with two other forms: Textual Theme (words that connect a message with the previous one e.g. “but,” “so,” “and” etc), and Interpersonal Theme (including things like modal adjuncts e.g. “regrettably,” “luckily,” “probably” etc.). (Wolter, 2009).

I now turn to an analysis of the chosen texts in the light of the foregoing. The excerpts from the essays by Lawrence and Stone and given in the Appendix.

***Love* by D. H. Lawrence**

In this essay, which appeared posthumously in the collection *Phoenix* edited by Edward McDonald, Lawrence is expounding in his customary style on the phenomenon of love. Lawrence wrote widely on many subjects, including psychology, social life and education, not claiming to be an expert in any of them, but offering useful insights into them nonetheless. Lawrence’s argument in the essay is that love is not, as the poets and novelists would have us believe, something universal, fixed or static, but a process of ebb and flow. The form of Lawrence’s essay fits his content perfectly, as I show below using a functional grammar analysis.

Clause complexes

Cl. C. 1	Love <u>is</u> the happiness of the world.
Cl. C. 2	But happiness <u>is</u> not the whole of fulfillment.
Cl. C. 3	Love <u>is</u> a coming together.
Cl. C. 4	But there <u>can be</u> no coming together without an equivalent going asunder.
Cl. C. 5	In love, all things <u>unite</u> in a oneness of joy and praise.
Cl. C. 6	Cl. a But they <u>could not unite</u> Cl. b unless they <u>were</u> previously apart.
Cl. C. 7	Cl. a And, <u>having united</u> in a whole circle of unity, Cl. b they <u>can go</u> no further in love.
Cl. C. 8	Cl. a The motion of love, like a tide, <u>is fulfilled</u> in this instance;

Cl. b there must be an ebb.

Cl. C. 9 Cl. a So that the coming together depends on the going apart;
 Cl. b the systole depends on the diastole;
 Cl. c the flow depends upon the ebb.

Cl. C. 10 There can never be love universal and unbroken.

Cl. C. 11 The sea can never rise to high tide over all the globe at once.

Cl. C. 12 The undisputed reign of love can never be.

Cl. C. 13 Because love is strictly a travelling.

Cl. C. 14 Cl. a "It is better to travel than to arrive,"
 Cl. b somebody has said.

Cl. C. 15 This is the essence of disbelief.

Cl. C. 16 It is a belief in absolute love,
 when love is by nature relative.

Cl. C. 17 It is a belief in the means, but not in the end.

Cl. C. 18 Cl. a It is strictly a belief in force,
 Cl. b for love is a unifying force.

Cl. C. 19 How shall we believe in force?

Cl. C. 20 Cl. a Force is instrumental and functional;
 Cl. b it is neither a beginning nor an end.

Cl. C. 21 Cl. a We travel in order to arrive;
 Cl. b we do not travel in order to travel.

Cl. C. 22 At least, such travelling is mere futility.
 We travel in order to arrive.

Cl. C. 23 And love is a travelling, a motion, a speed of coming together.

Cl. C. 24 Love is the force of creation.

Cl. C. 25 But all force, spiritual or physical, has its polarity, its positive and its negative.

Cl. C. 26 All things that fall, fall by gravitation to the earth.

Cl. C. 27 Cl. a But has not the earth, <<in the opposite of gravitation, >>
 Cl. b cast off the moon
 Cl. c and held her at bay in our heavens during all the aeons of time?
 So ^ IT IS with love.

Cl. C. 28 Love is the hastening gravitation of spirit towards spirit, and body towards body, in the joy of creation.

Cl. C. 29 Cl. a But if all be united in one bond of love,
 Cl. b then there is no more love.

Cl. C. 30 And therefore, for those who are in love with love, to travel is better than to arrive.

Cl. C. 31 Cl. a For in arriving one passes beyond love,
 Cl. b or, rather, one encompasses love in a new transcendence.

Cl. C. 34 To arrive is the supreme joy after all our travelling.

Cl. C. 35 The bond of love! What worse bondage can we conceive than the bond of love?

Cl. C. 36

- Cl. a It is an attempt to wall in the high tide;
- Cl. b it is a will to arrest the spring,
- Cl. c ^ IT IS A WILL never to let May dissolve into June,
- Cl. d ^ IT IS A WILL never to let the hawthorn petal fall for the berrying.

Cl. C. 37 This has been our idea of immortality, this infinite of love, love universal and triumphant.

Cl. C. 38 And what is this but a prison and a bondage?

Cl. C. 39 What is eternity but the endless passage of time?

Cl. C. 40 What is infinity but an endless progressing through space?

Investigating field in experiential meanings

Summary of Processes

The text is comprised of short clauses, most of them independent. There are no embedded clauses, though there is some ellipsis. I counted 57 clauses in all, out of which about 31 are relational. These are mostly relations of attribution. Some are relations of identification. There is only one possessive relation. Material processes make the next biggest group (about 23). There is only one verbal process and only two mental processes. The most frequent relational process is formed by the “be” verb, which attributes qualities to the participant “love.” This makes the passage a series of affirmations or declarations which seem to be objective truths. The frequency of material processes gives the text a sense of concreteness and reinforces the impression of factual presentation. Plus, they help conjure up concrete images in the mind of the reader which makes the text more accessible and more easily understood.

The text starts with relational processes in the very beginning, but then moves to a cluster of material processes. It then gives way to relationals, comes back briefly to material processes, and then alternates between the two. The whole structure is then repeated. First, the “truths” are given, then the text moves to prove them via examples presented through material processes. The single verbal process is introduced only for the purpose of criticizing it.

Summary of Participants.

For a majority of material processes, either the actor or the goal is missing. The author uses a lot of intransitive verbs that do not require a direct object. He also makes frequent use of the passive voice and utilizes plenty of prepositional phrases with embedded nominal groups. This works to minimize the impression of human agency. When no goals or actors are ascribed to material processes, it makes the text more philosophical, dealing in eternal and abstract truths, while providing the reader with concrete images at the same time. Things just “happen.” For example, clause complex 8: (“The motion of love, like a tide, is fulfilled in this instance // there must be an

ebb”), reads like an objective truth, not the author’s own opinion. In fact, the whole text reads like a series of universal truths.

For relational processes, the participants that correspond to value are “love” (mentioned ten times!); “happiness”; “force”; “all force” etc. The two mental processes use the verbs “believe” and “conceive” and have “we” as the senser, thus aligning the author with the reader and creating a bond between them. There is a lot of nominalization in the text. This helps to make the action universal and at the same time, less absolute. Consider the effect of changing “[t]here can be no coming together without an equivalent going asunder” to “no one can come together without going asunder.” The first statement reads like a universal truth, while the second sounds a lot less authoritative and more open to challenge.

Summary of Circumstances

The circumstances are mostly nominalizations, embedded in prepositional phrases. They usually mention abstract, sweeping, universal concepts: “in a oneness of joy and praise”; “in a whole circle of unity”; “over all the globe at once” etc.

Summary of Time

The text uses the simple present tense, which enhances its “universal” and “timeless” theme. The “be” verbs also give an impression of timelessness.

Investigating tenor in interpersonal meanings

Summary of Mood

Most clauses in the text are finite. There are only two non-finite verbs: “having united” (Cl. C. 7) and “in arriving” (Cl. C. 33). A lot of finites—at least ten—have negative polarity. In addition, there are negative mood adjuncts: “never” is used four times. Most clauses are declaratives, with five interrogative ones. The combined effect is again the imparting of eternal truths, the questions challenging the reader to disagree with the author. The extensive negative polarity adds to the vehemence of the author’s position. This is balanced against the affirmative statements. In a subtle way, the text is structured to reinforce its content: everything has positive and negative polarity; love cannot be at high tide all the time--this is a law of nature.

Person Selection

The first-person plural (we) is used seven times in the text. The rest of the nominal groups are third person. After stating his position in as emphatic a way as possible, the author appeals to the solidarity of the reader, including him/her in a warm, non-critical “we.” The implication is that the person who has said that it is better to travel than to arrive is not one of us.

Modalization

Mostly, the text makes a series of declarations with absolutely no modalization. The modal finites that are used are all negative except one, which is obligatory: “must” (Cl. C. 8).

Investigating mode in textual meanings

Most clauses have a textual theme appearing before the topical theme. The effect is both to make the text more informal, and to connect the ideas with one another. Most themes are unmarked except in clauses starting with “in love” (Cl. C. 5); “in arriving” (Cl. C. 33); “to arrive” (Cl. C. 34) etc. There is only one interpersonal theme: “at least” (Cl. C. 22). The reason why the interpersonal theme is not used more often is the same as why modalization is not used. The author carefully keeps himself out of the text in order to further the effect of the text as proclaiming universal truths instead of personal opinions.

Cohesion

True to the title of the essay, in this text the word “love” appears in almost every other clause. The text employs words appropriate to its pulsing to-and-fro imagery of coming together and going apart, positive polarity and negative polarity. The imagery of the high tide and its ebb, the pull and push of the earth’s gravitational field, the systole and diastole, all contribute to this rhythmic effect. In keeping with the grand theme of the essay, the words employed are likewise grand: “happiness”; “fulfillment”; “oneness”; “the globe”; “force”; “the aeons of time”; “eternity”; “infinity” etc.

Contextual description

Field of Discourse

We can say, judging from the experiential analysis, that the field of discourse is philosophy. The short term goal of the text is to clear up the misunderstanding about love as something that lasts forever. The long term goal might be to participate in philosophical and literary debates about the emotion of love.

Tenor of discourse

The author starts by setting up a balance between positive and negative polarity in the mood block. Then he presents a point of view (“it is better to travel than to arrive”), only to attack and question it. Because of the clever introduction, the reader is more open to agreeing with the author at this point. The introduction is really clever in that the author presents his own point of view (love is not a sustained emotion) in such a way that it appears perfectly reasonable and unbiased. He does this by presenting both ends of the spectrum, and by presenting the accepted view first. The whole text is structured this way. The questions are strategically placed to ensure the agreement of the reader.

Mode of Discourse

The medium is written; the type of interaction is monologue. It is a persuasive essay with mostly unmarked themes and only one interpersonal theme. The tone is simple, informal, and almost conversational. The clauses are simple and use a lot of textual themes to connect to each other.

A Short History of Love” by Lawrence Stone

Stone is a historian who tackles the same theme—romantic love—from the point of view of the social sciences. Accordingly, he uses a rational, scientific tone as compared to Lawrence’s more personal style. However, he makes the same point in his essay—that romantic love is a cultural construct and that there is nothing universal about it. The rhetorical strategies he uses to argue his point are very different from Lawrence’s, as I show below:

Clause complexes

Cl. C. 1	Cl. a Historians and anthropologists <u>are</u> in general agreement
	Cl. b that romantic love [[the usually brief but intensely felt and all-consuming attraction toward another person]] <u>is</u> culturally conditioned.
Cl. C. 2	Love <u>has</u> a history.
Cl. C. 3	It <u>is</u> common only in certain societies at certain times, or even in certain social groups within those societies, usually the elite, [[which have the leisure to cultivate such feelings]].
Cl. C. 4	Cl. a Scholars <u>are</u> , however, less certain
	Cl. b whether romantic love <u>is</u> merely a culturally induced psychological overlay on top of the biological drive for sex,
	Cl. c or whether it <u>has</u> biochemical roots [[that operate quite independently from the libido]].
Cl. C. 5	Cl. a <u>Would</u> anyone in fact " <u>fall</u> in love"
	Cl. b if they <u>had not read</u> about it
	Cl. c or ^IF THEY HAD NOT <u>heard</u> it talked about?
Cl. C. 6	Cl. a <u>Did</u> poetry <u>invent</u> love,
	Cl. b or ^ DID love ^ INVENT poetry?
Cl. C. 7	Some things <u>can be said</u> with certainty about the history of the phenomenon.
Cl. C. 8	Cl. a The first <u>is</u>
	Cl. b that cases of romantic love <u>can be found</u> in all times and places
	Cl. c and ^ CASES OF ROMANTIC LOVE <u>have often been</u> the subject of powerful poetic expression, from the Song of Solomon to Shakespeare.
Cl. C. 9	On the other hand, << as anthropologists <u>have discovered</u> >> neither social approbation nor the actual experience of romantic love <u>is</u> common to all societies.
Cl. C. 10	Cl. a Second, historical evidence for romantic love before the age of printing <u>is</u> largely <u>confined</u> to elite groups,
	Cl. b which of course <u>does not mean</u> that it <u>may not have occurred</u> lower on the social scale.
Cl. C. 11	Cl. a As a socially approved cultural artifact, romantic love <u>began</u> in Europe in the southern French aristocratic courts of the twelfth century,

Cl. b and was made fashionable by a group of poets, the troubadours.

Cl. C. 12 Cl. a In this case the culture dictated
 Cl. b that it should occur between an unmarried male and a married woman,
 Cl. c and that it either should go sexually unconsummated
 Cl. d or should be adulterous.

Cl. C. 13 By the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, our evidence becomes quite extensive, thanks to the spread of literacy and the printing press.

Cl. C. 14 Cl. a We now have love poems, such as Shakespeare's sonnets, love letters,
 Cl. b and autobiographies by women concerned primarily with their love lives.

Cl. C. 15 The courts of Europe were evidently hotbeds of passionate intrigues and liaisons, some romantic, some sexual.

Cl. C. 16 Cl. a The printing press also began to spread pornography to a wider public,
 Cl. b thus stimulating the libido,
 Cl. c while the plays of Shakespeare indicate
 Cl. d that romantic love was a concept familiar to society at large, [[which composed his audience]].

Cl. C. 17 [[Whether this romantic love was approved of, however]], is another question.

Cl. C. 18 Cl. a We simply do not know how
 Cl. b Shakespearean audiences reacted to Romeo and Juliet.

Cl. C. 19 Did they, <<like us (and as Shakespeare clearly intended)>>, fully identify with the young lovers?

Cl. C. 20 Cl. a Or, when they left the theater,
 Cl. b did they continue to act like the Montague and Capulet parents, [[who were trying to stop these irresponsible adolescents from allowing an ephemeral and irrational passion to interfere with the serious business of politics and patronage?]]

Cl. C. 21 Cl. a [[What is certain]] is
 Cl. b that every advice book, every medical treatise, every sermon and religious homily of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries firmly rejected both romantic passion and lust as suitable bases for marriage.

Cl. C. 22 Cl. a In the sixteenth century, marriage was thought
 Cl. b to be best arranged by parents, [[who could be relied upon to choose socially and economically suitable partners]].

Investigating field in experiential meanings

Summary of Processes.

The total number of processes in this text is around 47. Out of these, there are 16 relational processes. 12 of these are attributive, 3 possessive and 1 of identification. There are 8 mental and

3 verbal processes. The majority of processes in this text are material, numbering about 20. The preponderance of material processes shows that we are dealing with concrete data. The verbal processes strengthen this impression by showing that the author is relying on other sources to support his information. The mental processes reflect the state of mind of the author as well as the people he talks about. Because this text uses less relational attributive processes, it appears to be more objective.

Summary of Participants

An analysis of participants in material processes reveals a surprising phenomenon. A lot of clauses lack actors or goals. Many of these are either in the passive voice, which removes the need for actors, or they employ intransitive verbs that do not need goals. The only times the actors and goals are clearly defined are when the author is asking questions and is unsure about the answers (Cl. C. 5, 6, 19 & 20). The fact that these are interrogatives implies, of course, that the attribution of actors and goals is hypothetical and therefore not valid. There are only 4 instances in this text where the author is absolutely sure about his facts (Cl. C. 9, 11, 15 & 20). What this means is that, although the text as a whole comes across as very objective and “scientific,” a lot of it is in fact conjecture and guesswork.

Circumstances

There are a lot of prepositional phrases with nominal groups embedded in them. However, there are very few nominalizations. The circumstances usually provide historical context and greater detail about the persons and places being talked about.

Summary of Time

The text mainly uses the simple present tense. It also makes use of the past and recent past tenses. The past tense signals historical fact, while the present tells the reader what is known by historians and anthropologists at the present time.

Investigating tenor in interpersonal meanings

Summary of Mood

Most clauses are finite, except 4 which are non-finite. Among the finite clauses, most are declarative. There are 4 interrogatives, showing that the author is unsure how things were really like back in time. A few clauses employ negative polarity. The effect is of imparting historically accurate information. The interrogatives reinforce the validity of the declarative clauses, lending them more credibility.

Person Selection

The first person plural is used 4 times. The rest of the nominal groups are third person. The author makes the text more accessible by using the first person.

Modalization

Not surprisingly, the text employs quite a lot of modalization. The author's voice is heard in several modal finites and mood adjuncts. There are about 8 mood and comment adjuncts throughout the text. The number of modal finites is 7. Out of these, 3 are modal finites denoting obligation, occurring in the three dependent clauses in Cl. C. 12. The effect of using mood adjuncts is that they give us the author's opinion of the historical facts he is describing. For example, "thanks to the spread of literacy..." (Cl. C. 12). The modal finites, on the other hand, indicate degrees of certainty, probability, obligation, etc. and make the account more credible for their use. The author is not laying down universal truths, only telling us what historians and anthropologists have uncovered so far about the emotion of love. The text seems to be telling us only what is suggested by historical evidence. It is therefore tentative in some places, surer in others. The effect of this strategy is that as readers, we tend to accept as fact even that which the author has not described as certain.

Investigating mode in textual meanings

Most themes are unmarked, with participants as theme. 6 clauses have circumstances as theme and are therefore marked (Cl. C. 9, 10, 11, 12, 16 & 21). A few topical themes are preceded by textual themes. The effect is a conventional academic essay, with the marked themes providing variation in sentence structure more than anything else. This is more an informative essay than an argumentative one, although the author does have a point to make, namely that romantic love is a cultural construct, and that this fact is proved by historical evidence. The clauses in this text are longer and more complicated than the text by Lawrence, with a number of embedded clauses. On the other hand, it is not meant for a specialized audience and is easy to read.

Cohesion

The text uses words appropriate to history and anthropology. It uses scientific terminology, referring to romantic love as a "test case" and treating it as such. This increases the "scientific" credibility of the text. The text alternates between the present body of knowledge and historical fact, interspersed by questions where the author seems to be wondering out loud. Speculation alternates with historical fact, so that the reader is moved to believe in the validity of the speculation along with the facts.

Contextual description

Field of Discourse

The experiential domain of the text is history and anthropology, more particularly, the history of romantic love. Its short term goals are to inform the reader that romantic love is relative and cultural, not an immutable feature of every society. Its long term goals might be to add to the data available on this topic. The essay forms part of the literature on cultural criticism that has been so influential in recent years.

Tenor of Discourse

Even though he is evidently a specialist, Stone writes in an accessible, reader-friendly style, admitting the gaps in scientific knowledge, telling the reader what is known for certain. The essay is persuasive because of the many historical facts he mentions.

Mode of Discourse

The text is in written form, the type of interaction is a monologue. The author states the main idea in the very beginning and then sets out to show its validity in the rest of the essay.

Comparison of Both Essays

Since both essays deal with the same topic and reach the same conclusions, they can be said to belong to the same field. However, they are different in mode and tenor. As such, they employ different linguistic strategies to convince their readers of their arguments. Lawrence uses absolute statements with no modalization and expects the reader to accept them as universal truths. To make this possible, he uses two strategies. First, he sets up a positive and negative polarity in the very structure of his essay. This polarity corresponds with his subject-matter. Second, he brings in natural phenomena and compares his argument with them to show that love is a force of nature, and as such is subject to the laws of nature. These laws dictate that the tide shall rise and recede, that the earth shall attract and repel other bodies. Lawrence's use of abstract words and grand themes, his use of nominalization, passive voice and concrete imagery all help to make his essay poetic, philosophical and persuasive. Even though Lawrence is forcing his opinion upon the reader, all these factors disguise this fact and it does seem like he is talking about universal truths.

Stone uses linguistic strategies appropriate to his approach. He is an objective scientist, telling the readers in a friendly manner what research into older societies has revealed about love. He relies on the discipline of social science to support him in his argument. That is why he uses more material processes than relational ones. At the same time, he uses a lot of modalization to show that science is by no means absolutely sure about all things. This strategy makes the reader trust him enough to believe as factual even those things that he himself says are only intelligent guesswork. These seem to be naturally inferred from the factual findings. The frequent use of circumstances is important in this regard, because they locate the action in particular historical contexts. Overall, both texts are well-written and make good use of the linguistic resources available to them.

Conclusion

The foregoing discussion provides ample justification for Miller and Turci's claim that "the methods of linguistic analysis are entirely appropriate in the literature domain" (2010: 5). They endorsed the claim made by Ruqaiya Hasan that "[...] in verbal art the role of language is central. Here language is not as clothing to the body; it IS the body" (p. 4, emphasis by Miller & Turci). Along with that, they also acknowledged the importance of context and culture for interpreting a literary work. It is hoped that this paper has served as a useful practical exposition of these ideas.

References

Hasan, R. 1985. *Language, Linguistics and Verbal Art*. Geelong, Vic: Deakin University Press.

Lawrence, D. H. 1936, 1967. Love. In Edward McDonald (Ed.), *Phoenix*, 151-156.
London: Heinemann.

Miller, D. R. 2010. Construing the “primitive” primitively: Grammatical parallelism as patterning and positioning strategy in D. H. Lawrence. In Miller & Turci.

Miller, D. R., and Turci, M. (Eds.). 2010. *Language and Verbal Art Revisited: Linguistic Approaches to the Study of Literature*. London: Equinox.

Stone, L. 1997. A Short History of Love. In Christopher Gould & Ele Byington (Eds.), *Critical Issues in Contemporary Culture*, 129-132. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Wolter, B. 2009. *Functional Grammar* [PowerPoint slides]. Personal communication via email.

Appendix A

Excerpt from “Love” by D. H. Lawrence

Love is the happiness of the world. But happiness is not the whole of fulfillment. Love is a coming together. But there can be no coming together without an equivalent going asunder. In love, all things unite in a oneness of joy and praise. But they could not unite unless they were previously apart. And, having united in a whole circle of unity, they can go no further in love. The motion of love, like a tide, is fulfilled in this instance; there must be an ebb.

So that the coming together depends on the going apart; the systole depends on the diastole; the flow depends upon the ebb. There can never be love universal and unbroken. The sea can never rise to high tide over all the globe at once. The undisputed reign of love can never be.

Because love is strictly a travelling. “It is better to travel than to arrive,” somebody has said. This is the essence of disbelief. It is a belief in absolute love, when love is by nature relative. It is a belief in the means, but not in the end. It is strictly a belief in force, for love is a unifying force.

How shall we believe in force? Force is instrumental and functional; it is neither a beginning nor an end. We travel in order to arrive; we do not travel in order to travel. At least, such travelling is mere futility. We travel in order to arrive.

And love is a travelling, a motion, a speed of coming together. Love is the force of creation. But all force, spiritual or physical, has its polarity, its positive and its negative. All things that fall, fall by gravitation to the earth. But has not the earth, in the opposite of gravitation, cast off the moon and held her at bay in our heavens during all the aeons of time?

So with love. Love is the hastening gravitation of spirit towards spirit, and body towards body, in the joy of creation. But if all be united in one bond of love, then there is no more love. And therefore, for those who are in love with love, to travel is better than to arrive. For in arriving one passes beyond love, or, rather, one encompasses love in a new transcendence. To arrive is the supreme joy after all our travelling.

The bond of love! What worse bondage can we conceive than the bond of love? It is an attempt to wall in the high tide; it is a will to arrest the spring, never to let May dissolve into June, never to let the hawthorn petal fall for the berrying.

This has been our idea of immortality, this infinite of love, love universal and triumphant. And what is this but a prison and a bondage? What is eternity but the endless passage of time? What is infinity but an endless progressing through space?... (*Phoenix* 151-152)

Appendix B

Excerpt from “A Short History of Love” by Lawrence Stone

Historians and anthropologists are in general agreement that romantic love--the usually brief but intensely felt and all-consuming attraction toward another person--is culturally conditioned. Love has a history. It is common only in certain societies at certain times, or even in certain social groups within those societies, usually the elite, which have the leisure to cultivate such feelings. Scholars are, however, less certain whether romantic love is merely a culturally induced psychological overlay on top of the biological drive for sex, or whether it has biochemical roots that operate quite independently from the libido. Would anyone in fact "fall in love" if they had not read about it or heard it talked about? Did poetry invent love, or love poetry?

Some things can be said with certainty about the history of the phenomenon. The first is that cases of romantic love can be found in all times and places and have often been the subject of powerful poetic expression, from the Song of Solomon to Shakespeare. On the other hand, as anthropologists have discovered, neither social approbation nor the actual experience of romantic love is common to all societies. Second, historical evidence for romantic love before the age of printing is largely confined to elite groups, which of course does not mean that it may not have occurred lower on the social scale. As a socially approved cultural artifact, romantic love began in Europe in the southern French aristocratic courts of the twelfth century, and was made fashionable by a group of poets, the troubadours. In this case the culture dictated that it should occur between an unmarried male and a married woman, and that it either should go sexually unconsummated or should be adulterous.

By the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, our evidence becomes quite extensive, thanks to the spread of literacy and the printing press. We now have love poems, such as Shakespeare's sonnets, love letters, and autobiographies by women concerned primarily with their love lives. The courts of Europe were evidently hotbeds of passionate intrigues and liaisons, some romantic, some sexual. The printing press also began to spread pornography to a wider public, thus stimulating the libido, while the plays of Shakespeare indicate that romantic love was a concept familiar to society at large, which composed his audience.

Whether this romantic love was approved of, however, is another question. We simply do not know how Shakespearean audiences reacted to Romeo and Juliet. Did they, like us (and as Shakespeare clearly intended), fully identify with the young lovers? Or, when they left the theater, did they continue to act like the Montague and Capulet parents, who were trying to stop these irresponsible adolescents from allowing an ephemeral and irrational passion to interfere with the serious business of politics and patronage?

What is certain is that every advice book, every medical treatise, every sermon and religious homily of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries firmly rejected both romantic passion and lust as suitable bases for marriage. In the sixteenth century, marriage was thought to be best arranged by parents, who could be relied upon to choose socially and economically suitable partners.

